Book reviews

Talking About Troubles in Conversation,
Gail Jefferson, Edited by Paul Drew, John Heritage, Gene Lerner, and Anita Pomerantz. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2015, £64 (Hardback), 234pp. ISBN: 9780199937325.

The editors of this book are all prominent in their field, and any book that they are involved with is worth reading. To have all four of them together in a joint effort indicates that this is an unusually special occasion, and befits a collection of papers by Gail Jefferson (1938-2008). Including their Introduction, this volume contains seven chapters of a very high quality.

Chapters One to Six are all previously published analyses under the auspices of a single topic, from Jefferson's participation in a research project directed by John R.E. Lee at the University of Manchester, on troubles-telling in conversation. At the start of each chapter the editors provide readers with instructive accounts of how each paper fitted into the overall project, and the significance of the analyses within conversation analysis (CA).

Published accounts of Manchester as the centre for teaching ethnomethodology and CA are rare, so I feel justified in discussing the excellent Introduction within this review. To declare an interest, I read undergraduate and graduate degrees at the Department of Sociology, University of Manchester – the institution where Jefferson began her analytic work on troubles-telling in conversation. My teachers at the Department in the Coupland Building remembered her extremely fondly: she had been a dear friend and a highly valued colleague. Anecdotes of her time in Manchester were not only affectionate – her arrival in Manchester in 1978 dragging suitcases full of data – but these were often told for pedagogic purposes: recalling her demands for clarity, both of expression, and of the use of examples; her measured, cumulative delivery in seminars; her impatience with theoreticism, and with analytic claims unsupported by data; and her intricate critique of Francis Ford Coppola's *The Conversation*, extemporised after a showing she attended (at the Aaben Cinema in Hulme) with her new colleagues.

The Sociological Review, *Vol. 64, 1005–1015 (2016)* DOI: 10.1111/1467-954X.12437

Published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd., 9600 Garsington Road, Oxford OX4 2DQ, UK and 350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148, USA

During my studies I was a fortunate recipient of Jefferson's Occasional Paper (Jefferson 1981), a departmental series identifiable by their distinctive yellow card covers. It was a separate, and deliberately cross-cultural inquiry of conversational actions from the troubles-telling project, and it provided an opportunity for her to edit together some of Harvey Sacks' lectures as a service to the field, which were later published (Sacks 1984) alongside two of her troubles-telling papers that appear in this volume. The running acknowledgements in her Occasional Paper document the open data culture that distinguished CA at the time.

Jefferson's contributions to the field are immeasurable: transcribing, organizing, editing and indexing Sacks' lectures; devising and refining a transcription system (on a manual typewriter) that would enable the visualization of linguistic acts as social, interactional phenomena; authoring innovative papers that provided direction to CA researchers. It is going to be difficult to follow this collection, which the editors suggest in a promissory note (p. 1), in ways that capture the extent of Jefferson's importance to the establishment of CA and its penetration. For Jefferson's impact was not solely a corpus of work in textual form: she transformed existing research cultures through her "selfless . . . commitment" (p. 10) to the work, providing a role model for scholarly endeavour. Indeed, if I had a reservation about the Introduction, it delimits the relevance and scope of her approach to research. Naturally, the editors have steered the volume to suit the requirements of publication in a book series, Foundations of Human Interaction, but her modus operandi has wider lessons than appeal to conversation analysts. Whilst the papers that make up this book "continue to represent some of the most innovative work in the field" (p. 1), the editors could have added, without hyperbole, "and in sociology itself".

Furthermore, the Introduction underplays the extent of John Lee's locating CA, and of the troubles-telling project more particularly, within wider sociological concerns. Lee invited Jefferson to Manchester as a research associate for his SSRC funded project, "The Analysis of Conversations in which Troubles and Anxieties are Expressed". Jim Schenkein persuaded Lee that the position should be offered to Jefferson, despite Lee's reservations that she was "too senior and too important in the work to consider such a role" (p. 3). The editors include extracts from an affectionate but typically modest account written by Lee, of Jefferson's research on the project. Apart from asides on p. 21 and p. 96, there seems to be a lot of effort expended so as not to credit Lee with co-authorship of "The Rejection of Advice" (reprinted here as Chapter Three) in the contents list, or in the copyright acknowledgements. Not only does this contrast with Jefferson's acknowledgement of Lee's contributions (Chapter Four); it diminishes by omission Lee's significant input to the project through seminars and workshops, in the Department and in Glossop, where she was staying, and the levels of conceptualization – ethnomethodological and sociological – that he provided.

Indeed, the Introduction opts for a hermetic reconstruction of CA. One of the editors reminds us that the sociological distinctiveness of CA is attributable

to ethnomethodology (Goodwin and Heritage 1991); and that, at the time of the troubles-telling project, CA was clearer about its ethnomethodological moorings (Heritage 1984). It is regrettable, then, that the Introduction excises the many workshops on the troubles-telling project with the other resident ethnomethodologists in the Department, Rod (D.R.) Watson and Wes Sharrock. Nor does it reflect the beneficial discussions on troubles-telling that Jefferson had with the former Didsbury School of Education network of ethnomethodologists: including Michael A. Atkinson, Ted Cuff, David Hustler, George Payne, Ian Shelton; and with George Adoff from Buffalo State College, whose visit to the nearby Department of Social Administration at Manchester overlapped with Jefferson's.

No introduction could document the full extent of the reciprocal influences that Jefferson had on the research culture at Manchester, nor that the Manchester milieu had on elaborating and maintaining the links between ethnomethodology and CA within Jefferson's troubles-telling research. Far more significant than the Didsbury connection, as mentioned above, was John Lee's influence on her orientations – both at conceptual and data-management levels, encouraging her analysis of longer sequences, which was a debate being conducted in Manchester at that time. The otherwise magisterial Introduction fails to account for these, however.

The organization of the chapters is significant for following the troubles-telling project. The final paper, published in 1988, is presented as Chapter One. This paper was derived from the final report to the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), the sponsors of the troubles-telling project. The editors were clear about the unusual qualities of this SSRC report to the field at the time (Heritage 1984) and they provide brief historical notes on this in their Introduction (pp. 21–22). Whilst chronologically the most recent of the analyses, this paper, "On the sequential organization of Troubles-Talk in conversation", encapsulates the project so precisely that it serves as an excellent opening and overview.

The subsequent chapters were written during or shortly after the project, and the editors have arranged these in a sequence coherent with how conversationalists arrive at stages in troubles-telling talk. Jefferson identifies six stages in the troubles-telling sequence that are afforded attention within these chapters. The foreshadowing and introduction of trouble (Chapter Two); the interactional contingencies of ensuring that troubles are presented fully (Chapter Three); the asymmetric production of laughter by the troubles-teller and the recipient as constituent features of troubles-tellings (Chapter Five); and the delicacies of moving away from talk about troubles in conversation (Chapter Six).

Troubles-telling sequences provide an interactional burden for the recipient as well as the teller, and her analyses are uniquely sensitive to the subtleties of hearership, also. This is particularly evident in Chapter Four, "On the interactional unpackaging of a 'gloss'", one of the highlights of the CA corpus,

wherein Jefferson identified the "reasonable" conversational glosses associated with the troubles-telling of "illness" that are sequentially disambiguated as "malingering":

> "what is implied is that with an intention to go to work, she *just lay down on the couch*, where what actually occurred might better be characterized as: abandoning the intention to go to work, *she went to bed.*" (p. 131)

The presentation of Jefferson's papers makes available the changes over time in CA. New researchers in CA become familiar with the restriction to develop all analyses from data. However, it is noticeable how Jefferson presents readers with extended extracts of talk. (Memorable features of CA training at Manchester were the long transcripts passed around – some of considerable length – generously brought over to Manchester by Jefferson for use by anyone interested in analysing talk.) It is, perhaps, a restriction – real or perceived – from publishers regarding how much transcript data can be included in a paper. It is thus worth highlighting strengths and felicities of her papers themselves vis-à-vis 'contemporary' CA: Jefferson located her data towards the beginning of her analyses rather than positioning extracts throughout the paper, as mere illustrations of arguments, which (to borrow Sacks' phrase) can give data extracts a "character appears on cue" quality; she returns to stretches of data throughout the same article, which confirms an emphasis on explication of data; her concentration on explication and developing her arguments produces exhaustive analyses of data.

Moreover, the papers collected here exhibit a parsimonious use of literature that would be unrecognizable in refereed publications today. Her reference points are tightly drawn, and in the main these revolve around Harvey Sacks' writings. This is not solely attributable to the newness and breadth of the field at the time. Rather, there is a refreshing focus on a particular phenomenon, unencumbered by current publishing requirements to situate the inquiry.

The key difference is the straightforward prose that Jefferson employed in her analyses. Jefferson was developing the technical vocabulary of CA as she analysed these data, and one of the defining characteristics of this book is being witness to the articulation of CA as-it-happened; which, in her distinctive, understated writing style, is frequently laugh-out-loud funny. What we have in these chapters is distinctively human: analyses that are faithful to the social aspect of everyday life.

The collection provides a sustained treatment of troubles-telling that is unavailable in article form; re-reading these papers as a corpus is ultimately very satisfying. Drew, Heritage, Lerner, and Pomerantz not only gather together some of the finest analyses in CA within a coherent collection: they remind us of how 'radical' CA was in its methodological options, recording and transcribing talk as-it-happens; and in its returning definitional privilege to participants who constitute settings and their contexts, rather than sociologists' ex cathedra re-descriptions.

This is not just CA at its "technical best" (p.24). The editors have curated exhibition pieces of sociology in their purest form.

Manchester Metropolitan University Andrew Carlin

References

Goodwin, Charles and Heritage, John 1990. "Conversation analysis" *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 283–307.

Heritage, John 1984. "Recent developments in conversation analysis" Warwick Working Papers in Sociology No. 1. Department of Sociology, University of Warwick.

Jefferson, Gail 1981. "The abominable 'ne?': A working paper exploring the phenomenon of post-response pursuit of response" Manchester Sociology Occasional Papers No. 6. Department of Sociology, University of Manchester.

Sacks, Harvey 1984. "Notes on methodology." In J. Maxwell Atkinson & John C. Heritage (Eds.) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 21–27.

Undisciplining Knowledge: Interdisciplinarity in the Twentieth Century, Harvey J. Graff, Baltimore, MA: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015, $44.95 (Hardback) and $34.95 (Paperback), xvi + 323 pp. ISBN: 9781421417462.

In *Undisciplining Knowledge* Harvey Graff examines the development of academic fields of study over the course of the twentieth century. Graff's approach is primarily historical and comparative; rather than systematically trying to explain the dynamics of academic differentiation or narrating the history of individual fields, he presents six pairs of case studies. His goal is to contribute to current debates about interdisciplinarity by presenting, discussing and comparing a variety of the "successes" and "failures" of and in academic fields in the modern American university.

The book consists of an introduction and six chapters. In his different chapters, Graff explores, more or less in chronological order, the development of six pairs of academic fields: (1) genetic biology and sociology, (2) the humanities and communication, (3) social relations and operations research, (4) cognitive science and new histories, (5) materials science and cultural studies, and (6) bioscience and literacy studies. Instead of focusing on some of the classical disciplines, Graff is primarily concerned with the "mixed outcomes" of interdisciplinary initiatives across academia.

Undisciplining Knowledge contains many informative discussions and ideas. Graff discusses, for example, topics including the convergence of fields such as natural philosophy, zoology, botany, physiology, or cytology that led to the emergence of biology. In his account, biology (as a new discipline) emerged from many disciplines. It began to prevail in the early decades of the twentieth century; it collected many subfields under a single umbrella (even if several departments of botany and zoology continued to exist for quite some time at

several universities). It manifested itself as *the* science of life – especially in a historical period in which this type of research moved from the field to the lab and in a social context in which 'amateur naturalists' could rapidly be replaced by certified professionals in institutions of higher learning. In the first chapter of his book, Graff particularly contrasts the history and place of genetic biology with sociology's lineage and transformation. The ambitions seem similar: while biology positioned itself as the science of life, sociology aimed to become *the* science of society. But Graff focuses on the differences between both fields of study as they became practiced and institutionalized in the early twentieth century. He claims, in short, that the sciences of life trumped that of society. Despite the ambitions of its founding fathers, sociology did not prove able to unite and inspire different subfields. Graff does not say much about possible explanations, but repeatedly states that sociology lost its potential to be a successful "interdiscipline" and acquire sound institutional standing within the American academic system.

A similar narrative is presented in the third chapter, in which social relations (as practiced at Harvard University) and operations research are compared and contrasted. On the one hand, the emphasis is on the impact of World War II and the Cold War on the field of operations research. Following Graff, this setting allowed for the development of an interdiscipline that could claim to provide the basis for action, for control of the future – both in periods of war and peace. Although less known outside the field of management or organization studies, Graff claims that operations research has become a "model interdiscipline". On the other hand, he discusses how local resistance to sociology, especially by economists, led Talcott Parsons to establish the interdisciplinary Department of Social Relations at Harvard University. The programmatic *Toward a General Theory of Action*, drafted by Parsons and some of his colleagues, had to serve as the Department's official doctrine (its 'yellow book') and guide all future research and teaching. But this proclamation of "Parsonian truths" serves for Graff as the example of how *not* to build an interdisciplinary program. Despite the inclusion of sociologists, anthropologists and social psychologists, the Harvard experiment did not allow for the development of a coherent program of empirical research by a community of social scientists.

The other chapters of this book contrast other academic fields, but the line of argumentation is the same. Graff presents paired case studies; he looks at the genesis of each field and tries to account for some commonalities and differences in the process of institutionalization. His focus mainly is on the struggle for "homes of their own". From this focus, he looks at the "signs or measures of success or limits" in different eras and institutional contexts. He judges some fields to fall short of intellectual coherence and shared vision. He is also highly critical of what he considers to be excessive claims on behalf of applied interdisciplinary projects (such as communication research). While his assessments (expressed with terms such as "failed interdisciplines" or

"nondisciplines") may well be reasonable, he offers or discusses no specific criteria on which such assessments may be based.

Graff prefers not to rehearse standard histories of particular academic fields. His preferred strategy instead is that of criticizing available accounts. *Undisciplining Knowledge* contains large numbers of very long quotations from available reflections on the history of particular fields of study. It is mainly in discussion with this literature that Graff develops his arguments and delivers his assessments. In large part, the book is based upon such critical reading of secondary sources. Only in the book's first chapter, a more or less systematic attempt is made to present historical data about factors that bear upon the institutionalization processes (faculty numbers, curricular programs, etc.). Occasionally other factors are mentioned (scholarly associations, journals, conferences). But overall the case studies go into too many directions. While the book would have benefited from the addition of a concluding chapter, it probably is no coincidence that no such chapter is included. Graff's review of six pairs of academic fields often is informative and also sheds light on a number of factors that might account for the "success" or the "limits" of particular fields of research, but his preferred strategy makes it quite difficult to arrive at broader, systematic conclusions.

Graff has been engaged in interdisciplinary research and teaching for most of his successful academic career. He also served as President of the Social Science History Association, which unquestionably is an interdisciplinary scholarly association. But do his analyses and assessments really imply that we have to "undiscipline knowledge" – as the book's title suggests. At least a question mark needs to be added to the book's main title. But we also need more systematic explorations of the dynamics of academic differentiation and the interplay between disciplines and "interdisciplines".

Ghent University (Belgium) &
University of Chicago (USA) Raf Vanderstraeten

Trapped in the Gap: Doing Good in Indigenous Australia,
Emma Kowal, New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2015, £60 (Hardback), 215 pages, ISBN: 9781782386049.

In his 2013 article *The Relative Native*, Brazilian scholar Eduardo Vivieros de Castro highlights the assumptions of privilege in anthropology's production of knowledge over subaltern native peoples. He turns the argument by provocatively asking of his profession: "What if we refuse to give this kind of strategic advantage to the anthropologist's discourse over that of the native? . . . [W]hat happens when the translator decides to betray his own tongue?" (Vivieros de Castro 2013: 475).

It is this territory of critical thought that Emma Kowal's book *Trapped in the Gap: Doing Good in Indigenous Australia* occupies. In it she examines

the White, progressive, middle-class professionals working in the field of Indigenous health in the Northern Territory of Australia. This choice of topic is refreshing and an important contribution to the new turn in anthropology to 'study up'; that is, to focus not on extracting knowledge from a targeted 'other', but rather to turn the lens on the cohort who seek to understand, remediate, and help this 'other'.

Kowal explicitly avoids staking out a moral judgement over what she labels as the 'White anti-racist' prototype. Instead, her work is a cultural study of this social grouping at work in the pseudonymous Darwin Institute of Indigenous Health, that plots their social and bureaucratic movements, and their often ambivalent ideas and actions. As she outlines in her introductory chapter, Kowal herself worked for many years as a health professional in the Northern Territory, and she clearly identifies as a white anti-racist. Yet she ambitiously positions her work as more than ethnography, and instead as an extended thesis on the problematic recognition of Indigenous difference within liberal settler-colonial societies. The full significance of Kowal's work extends far beyond race relations in Australia's Northern Territory; indeed, she describes her research field as "a microcosm of the global politics of inequality and its alleviation" (8). *Trapped in the Gap* is thus in serious conversation with not only other Australian social scientists such as Tess Lea, Ghassan Hage, Patrick Sullivan, and Gillian Cowlishaw, but also international scholars such as Anna Lowenhaupt-Tsing, David Mosse, and Ann Laura Stoler whose works focus on the trickier aspects of intercultural relationality under late-colonial liberalism.

The title of the book succinctly summarises a key theme: how White anti-racists are conflicted by their agency in remedying Indigenous socioeconomic disadvantage, whilst also striving to respect and maintain distinct Indigenous cultural difference. Using this trope of being "trapped in the gap", Kowal raises many moral and political dilemmas the white anti-racist health professional must grapple with. For example, if most health promotion messages conflict with Indigenous social practices, are they a form of neo-colonialism? Does help equal domination? Does the policy aim of "closing the gap" on Indigenous disadvantage infer assimilation? As Kowal writes, "the dilemma of social improvement is the fear that improving Indigenous health will inevitably make Indigenous people resemble White people" (49).

In the first chapter Kowal more closely analyses the force of benevolence, and the social dynamics of a privileged elite who are "doing good" (22). This works to more closely define her objects of analysis. She also describes here the ambivalence and even hostility her project encountered from some research participants who were wary of her unconventional line of enquiry.

The second chapter discusses how Indigenous difference is conceptualised by bureaucracy and mainstream society and, in particular, how the notion of "remedial difference" has worked to create a statistically-defined impetus for ongoing government intervention into the Indigene. As Kowal writes: "In recent years, 'closing the gap' has become the virtual slogan of Indigenous affairs... But the imperative to do this draws on a historically and culturally

specific set of beliefs and norms largely described through the concept of liberalism . . . and a sense that our lives can be improved through good government" (35). However, another more problematic gap exists between what Kowal calls "remedial" or "sanitised" difference (marked by statistical inequalities between the Indigenous and non-Indigenous populations regarding health, life expectancy, education, employment, and other indicators) and "radical" or "unsanitised" difference (understood as intractable Indigenous alterity that doesn't readily conform to mainstream societal expectations). It is within this ambiguous cultural space which the White anti-racist must constantly negotiate and perform her identity.

Chapter three departs somewhat from the book's core subject matter by ethnographically analysing intercultural relations at a supermarket in suburban Darwin (the capital city of the Northern Territory). Here, Kowal focuses on the contact zone between local non-Indigenous residents and a community of "long grassers" – Indigenous itinerants living rough in bushland at the rear of the supermarket and who "represent the most extreme form of radical difference cohabiting urban space" (57).

A stand-out section of the book is chapter four, which contains a trenchant analysis of the emergence of the Welcome to Country and Acknowledgement of Traditional Owners rituals in Australia. These rituals now regularly precede many public events, and consist of a short ceremony recognising Indigenous custodianship over the land. Kowal identifies the role of these performances as "rich in meaning: they are simultaneously symbols of colonisation and dispossession; of recognition and reconciliation; and a periodic focus of political posturing" (87). One pathway she explores of understanding the white anti-racist's attachment to these rituals is because "anxieties about belonging remain central to Australian identity" (106). Although these ceremonies are intended to express recognition of Indigenous Australians, they are also bound by rules and limitations that may belie an aspect of tokenism. Kowal demonstrates this by recounting a Welcome to Country ceremony performed by the local Darug people in Sydney, in which they re-enacted a frontier massacre scene and remained on stage longer than expected, "causing intense embarrassment to those present" (101). Chapter five is an extension of this discussion of recognition under liberalism. In it she introduces the term "conditional recognition", by which the minority may be afforded distinctiveness, but not enough difference to fall outside of legal and institutional control (114-115).

In chapter six, Kowal grapples with what she coins "White stigma", or the white anti-racist's recurring behaviours of self-effacement and suffering due to their position of social privilege (a theme she has explored in depth in her past publications (for example Kowal, 2012)). Again, she doesn't judge the moral validity of this emotional experience, but uses it to understand the white anti-racists' common practices of downplaying their own agency, and their observed willingness to suffer hardships and humiliations without complaint.

Trapped in the Gap innovatively covers much ground on a topic hitherto largely ignored by the field of anthropology, and boldly concludes that the

dichotomous identities that structure bureaucratic action in the Indigenous affairs arena are their own form of ontological trap. Kowal advocates for a more non-oppositional identity politics, and leaves us to ponder "the possibility of help across racial and other lines of privilege . . . Are there any viable alternatives for White anti-racists who wish to help others without oppressing them?" (15).

Yet therein arguably lies a shortcoming of this book. Despite Kowal's calls for more fluid and less racialised identities as a strategy for overcoming the trap of intercultural relations, at many points the text reverts to constructing and reinforcing cultural categories. Much space is given to typifying the white anti-racist professional (see 31–35). Kowal does justify the delimitations of her thematic focus (12), however this sometimes leads her into clunky generalisations and essentialised descriptions of her research objects. For example: "the subjectivity of White anti-racists can be broken down into its constituent parts . . . My task was to understand all the aspects that produced the subjectivity we all identified with (but usually could not name)" (33). Or: "For many anti-racists living in the contact zone, the beliefs they bring to the north are challenged by their personal and professional experiences in contact zones. Instead of certainty, they experience confusion and incommensurability" (58-59). These caricatures of the white anti-racist may be permissible for analytical expediency, but they also serve to ignore many of the intercultural nuances and ambiguities at play, and the various overlaps of class, privilege, and race in a place like the Northern Territory. For someone like me who lived and worked in this setting for many years, Kowal's depiction of its social fabric seems somewhat contrived.

Perhaps a more fundamental critique of *Trapped in the Gap* is its handling of liberalism. Kowal heavily draws on the works of Elizabeth Povinelli in deconstructing the politics of Indigenous recognition and the existential perils of the white anti-racist in navigating various subjective dilemmas. However, Kowal's line of individualised, almost psychoanalytical analysis is not one that Povinelli herself pursues in her work. Instead, Povinelli tends towards a structural analysis of liberalism that focuses on the social worlds it creates. Within this analysis, a multicultural society interplays with neoliberal economies, and liberal strategies for the governance of difference are necessarily coupled with the governance of markets (Povinelli 2002; Povinelli 2012; Povinelli, 2015). This important aspect of liberal governmentality is oddly overlooked in *Trapped in the Gap*, even though capitalism (a term Kowal never once uses in her book) and its material realities are deeply intrinsic to contemporary Indigenous lifeworlds in the Northern Territory. Here, the modern Indigenous community health clinic exists alongside private property markets, a large Australian and American military presence, a vast pastoral industry, and numerous mining operations owned by multinational corporations – all of which are quietly extracting billions of dollars of wealth each year from Indigenous lands. As it stands, Kowal's book is an important study of identity politics, race and inequality under liberalism. It deserves a wide international audience. Yet her

work would be enriched by examining more thoroughly the conditions underlying race-based inequality, and how material aspects of liberalism frame the project of "doing good" in Indigenous Australia.

University of Sydney Thomas Michel

References

Kowal, Emma. 2012. "Stigma and suffering: white anti-racist identities in northern Australia." *Postcolonial Studies* 15(1): 5–21.

Povinelli, Elizabeth. 2002. *The Cunning of Recognition: Indigenous Alterities and the Making of Australian Multiculturalism*. London: Duke University Press.

Povinelli, Elizabeth. 2015. "Transgender Creeks and the Three Figures of Power in Late Liberalism." *differences* 26(1): 168–187.

Povinelli, Elizabeth. and Kim Turcot DiFruscia. 2012. "A Conversation with Elizabeth A. Povinelli." *Trans-Scripts* (2): 76–90.

Vivieros De Castro, Eduardo. 2013. "The Relative Native." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 3(3): 473–502.